New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

MONDAY, APRIL 17, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; R. H. Walds, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.00	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Daily & Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.00	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.32	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.20	One month	.50
One year	15.00	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

New York Still Holds the Bag.

Mayor Mitchel's protest about the size and items of the annual appropriations bill at Albany is one which should be heeded, not only in the interest of the overburdened taxpayers of this city, but of the state at large. The failure of the budget makers to reduce the total of their proposed appropriations bears particularly hard on New York City, for, as the Mayor points out, if the bill goes through in its present shape all the revenue there is in sight, and then some, will be needed to meet the appropriations thus made.

That will mean either a direct tax or the raising of additional sums by indirect taxation. Since, for political reasons, the legislative majority has decided not to levy a direct tax, every cent which can be squeezed out of indirect taxation will be taken by the state authorities. In that case this city's hope of having the state pay the regulatory expenses of the Public Service Commission and the upkeep of normal schools here will go a-glimmering. And there will be no refund from the state to the city for automobile licenses, excise tax or stock transfer tax, such as the Mayor has advocated and the taxpayers have hoped for.

In short, unless the lawmakers are willing to practise sharper economy than their bill calls for, this city seems unlikely to obtain any actual financial relief this year save the fact that it will not have to provide its share of a direct tax. New York deserves better treatment than that. It expects to have a good part, at least, of Senator Brown's legislative programme enacted into law. But what good are bills designed to relieve the city of some of its burdens if the money which the state should pay for that purpose is not available?

The total appropriations of the state have reached a staggering figure. If the money were carefully spent—spent to produce as good results as a corporation demands from expenditures in its business—the total would be much less; or, for the present expenditure, New York State would be a vastly better governed commonwealth. An appropriation bill now includes a big percentage of "pork." Local improvements are charged to the state for political reasons; jobs are created and salaries raised to take care of political heelers. Department expenses are multiplied without adequate result.

Senator Horton's recent investigation of the civil service showed how inadequately and expensively the routine business of the state is conducted. Yet the Legislature this year refused to pass a bill for a decent, honest budget system, so the public might know how its money was being spent, and grudgingly consented to make a few slight—very slight—improvements in the present vicious system of parcelling out the state's funds with a great show of adopting a reform.

New York City's financial fate is in the hands of the lawmakers. If they consider it to be good politics they may grant some relief—not as a matter of right and justice, but as a matter of expediency. Otherwise, despite the Mayor's protests and the protests of all the taxpayers here, the inflated appropriations bill will be adopted, and everybody here may whistle.

Until there is a fair and honest budget system there will be no way of enforcing an honest appropriations bill, and there never will be a decent budget system until the entire state is aroused to the "economy issue" as a mere question of dollars and cents has not yet been able to arouse this political generation.

Dissipation's Bill.

The Rev. Dr. W. A. R. Goodwin, rector of St. Paul's Church, Rochester, N. Y., has been informed that New York City spends $1,000,000 a day in dissipation. It is a "recent estimate," he says, though how one arrives at such an estimate in the absence of statistics and of any definition of dissipation on which two persons can agree teases the imagination. Still, Dr. Goodwin, or his informant, is entitled to guess and so are the rest of us. Our guess would be that he erred grievously on the side of conservatism.

It may be that when first class warfare cost a nation only a million dollars a day New York spent much the same amount on her daily frivolities. But both war and dissipation have made strides since then, keeping in touch to some extent through the war contract. A recent British observer has recorded the shock with which he encountered the unbridled license of the Great White Way after the sober consecration of London, forgetting that the greater the expenditure for munitions of war on the other side the more thunderous the downpour of war contract profits along Broadway. A million a day (if the night be included) is really too ridiculously inadequate an estimate for this year of grace—or disgrace.

Is it not even possible that if Uncle Sam in his turn should exchange the white lights for war the amount saved through curtailment of dissipation in New York alone would go far toward paying his fighting bills? This is a point the good clergyman didn't raise, but it seems well worth considering.

Recruiting in England.

While it is clear from all accounts that the opponents of general compulsory service are to have their way in Great Britain, it is by no means to be assumed that those who have been clamoring for the entire exemption of married men have succeeded in coercing the government. Their demand that all single men should be called upon first was altogether impracticable, and Lord Derby is undoubtedly right in his assertion that it would prove ruinous to the industries of the nation. On the other hand, the protests of those with families were fully justified, not only in respect of the inadequate provision made for their dependents, but in respect also of the feeble manner in which compulsion was applied under the service act.

The exemptions provided for on the score of occupation or conscience were, in fact, so numerous that no one is really obliged to serve who does not wish to do so. To talk of compulsion under the circumstances is really farcical. Nor is this entirely or even mainly the fault of the tribunals. It is true that in many instances the conscientious objectors have been dealt with far too leniently; it is true also that in some cases the most flimsy excuses for exemption have been too readily accepted. As a general rule, however, those who have asked for total exemption have been obliged to content themselves with postponement, and the real difficulty lies in the absurdly long lists of certified occupations, so-called.

The probability is that sooner or later these lists will have to be much curtailed if not abolished entirely. Then each case can be considered on its merits. It is quite certain that more single men will have to be drafted, and the only way to secure them is by a careful revision of the exemptions under the head of reserved trades. The married men are justified in demanding such revision if only on account of the very definite pledge given by the government and so often reiterated by Mr. Asquith, Lord Derby and various Cabinet ministers.

But this does not mean that the married men who have already attested will be excused. Whatever happens, it is certain that they, too, will be called upon. They must be, in order to keep up the minimum requirements of the army. The Derby scheme was a failure. That is admitted on all hands, and it is useless to speculate on the reasons of the failure. Politicians may make use of the failure as a means to convict the government of incompetence, but for the moment the only question of any importance is how to raise the men that are urgently needed to maintain the strength of the divisions at home and abroad.

The married men have good reason to accuse the government of not sticking to the pledge that was made so solemnly, but in the present critical state of affairs protests on that account would be untimely and idle.

Cigarettes and Degeneration.

It is to be gathered from a paper in the current "Medical Times" that our unhappy country is dangerously threatened by the increasing popularity of the cigarette. The author vows he is no friend of the pipe, and, indeed, it is evident that he hates tobacco in all forms; but the cigarette is his particular aversion, and he is satisfied that unless something can be done to put a stop to it the nation must infallibly perish.

Every boy has been told that smoking stunts growth, but for a clear demonstration of this fact nothing so satisfactory has ever been seen as the photograph that adorns the doctor's paper. It shows four boys, two of them head and shoulders over the other two. The big fellows never smoked and the little fellows had smoked for a long time. "It seems more than a mere coincidence," says the doctor.

The cigarette, the doctor thinks, is more dangerous than strong drink. Englishmen smoke cigarettes. "The average British workman," he says, "is a poorly developed, ambitionless subject. Three-fourths of the applicants for the army and navy were in the past rejected as unfit. Nearly all then exhibited the stain upon the fingers of the cigarette." Where he got this curious information about the fingers of the rejected he does not tell us, but let us not flatter ourselves that we are better off than the English. We seem, indeed, to be in a worse case, for the author quotes Mr. Daniels as having announced that only one in six of the applicants for our navy is accepted. Examination would doubtless show cigarette stains on the fingers of both hands; yet these applicants, the doctor assures us, represented "the best America had." To such a state has the cigarette reduced us to-day!

But that is not all. The list of disasters attributable to tobacco is so prodigious that the wonder is how any smoker manages to live at all. The doctor is in great hopes that steps will be taken to put a stop to cigarettes in public, at least. "I do not see," he says, "why women and innocent little children are compelled to live in an atmosphere of cigarette smoke." He does not think that a clean water supply is by any means so important to a city as the protection of the air from cigarette smoke.

As to the innocent little children, it is a little doubtful whether there will be any of them left in a few years, for it seems the declining birthrate (whatever people may say about birth control) is really a consequence of tobacco smoking. "France," the doctor tells us, "would in time depopulate herself without war or violence," and the implication is that this disastrous state of affairs is due to the popularity of the cigarette.

In attempting to account for the peculiar dangers of the cigarette the doctor quotes with approval Mr. Edison's profound observations on the presence of acrolein in the smoke from cigarette papers. This substance, it seems, has "a violent action on the nerve centres, producing degeneration of the cells of the brain." An important fact; but since the minute quantity of acrolein produced by the combustion of cigarette papers has so appalling an effect, it is a pity the doctor did not undertake to explain how kitchen maids ever manage to survive the dose imparted in a whiff of burning fat.

Our Official Bomb Opener.

These be nervous times, but probably no one is so well aware of it as Inspector Eagan, of the Bureau of Combustibles. We should enjoy having the inspector's opinion of the flights of human imagination which keep him on the go, prying into sphinx-like bundles in search of high explosives.

On Thursday, for example, he was called in haste to the Barge Office at the Battery to investigate the contents of a small box found under a bench in the women's waiting room. Through its outer covering could be heard the ominous ticking which measures the moments of fate. No layman cared even to stay in the same room with this demure parcel, much less to open it. To the intrepid inspector it yielded forth an ordinary alarm clock. (We leave the rest to the punsters.)

But, having solved this riddle, Inspector Eagan had hardly regained his office before receiving a summons to a loft building in White Street. A section of pipe had been found there, fifteen inches long, two inches in diameter and closed at one end with an iron cap and at the other with a porcelain cover, through which protruded the ends of copper wires. There was no tick to this grim bit of hardware, but it made up in appearance for what it lacked in articulation. Nevertheless, the inspector opened it immediately, to find only wire within—some sort of electrical attachment, he thought it was, fashioned by an amateur.

No doubt these incidents provide a fair cross-section of the inspector's present daily activities. The scares are many; the bombs few. Still, for such an eager ferret, he seems to be taking his many disappointments philosophically. He has probably made his peace with human nature ere this, and it may be, of course, that even he prefers a great many alarm clocks to one infernal machine. In any case, his dauntless industry deserves the profound gratitude of a panicky public.

Surrogate Cohalan has ruled that there's no value to the "goodwill" of the New York Baseball Club, because of the uncertain ability of the Giants to win the pennant. That's a fine omen for the beginning of the season!

Officer and Soldier.

(From The Dundee Advertiser.)

A very good story is going the rounds, and there seems to be no doubt of its truth, writes a military correspondent. On a recent occasion a British soldier, carrying all his equipment on his back and his rifle in his hand, was walking along a French road. Wearily, he listened to the approach from the rear of a motor car, and with a passing glance he noticed that the car was driven by a young officer, who, in turn, glanced at the tired man. The car stopped. "Jump in," said the officer, and the soldier gladly obeyed the kindly given order. The two conversed, grew quite confidential, and at last the soldier, putting his hand in his pocket, drew out a photograph and, showing it to the officer, remarked: "That is my girl." They talked about the photograph, and eventually the soldier respectfully asked the officer, "Have you a sweetheart, sir?" "No," replied the officer, "but I can show you my father's photograph." And he drew from an inside pocket a photograph of King George. The young officer was the Prince of Wales.

Money in Scraps.

(From the Providence Journal.)

It pays to save waste materials of all kinds—the last financial statement of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad shows that in 1915 the sales of old iron, rope, paper, rags, hose, barrels, bags, brass and copper aggregated $951,861. This substantial addition to revenues comes at a most opportune time, and the experience of the railroad should encourage individuals and business houses to look after the odds and ends.

There is a money value on many, if not all, of the things that ordinarily are thrown away as worthless. The housekeeper, as well as a railroad company, can get something for metal, rags, paper and the other articles that naturally go to the scrap heap. In the case of one family the amounts may not be large, but every cent gained helps to reduce living expenses and the raw materials of the country also are conserved.

Tarnished.

A German soldier, wearing on his breast
The Iron Cross, of all things he possessed

The dearest, since it had been bravely won
By splendid deeds of valor, nobly done,

Sat in a trench amid the field guns' din
And read a month-old paper from Berlin.

The Kaiser, so he learned, had given to
A submarine commander and his crew

The Iron Cross, because with courage great
They sent an unarmed liner to her fate

And thus upheld the Fatherland's renown
By leaving women and their babes to drown.

By this brave news his soldier heart was stirred,
And then he read, "The cross has been conferred

On many gallant airmen, who displayed
Such valor in the last Zeppelin raid

When bombs were dropped and English blood was spilled
And fifteen mothers with their babes were killed."

A choking sound escaped the soldier's throat;
He tore the Iron Cross from off his coat,

Flung it to earth, and with a muttered "Gott!"
Stamped it in mud and spat upon the spot!

BERTON BRALEY.

"COL. ROOSEVELT FOR PRESIDENT"

Little Question of the Immense Popularity of This Sentiment.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been a very interested reader of your valuable paper for several years, and I take pleasure in saying to you that I consider The Tribune the most reliable newspaper and the quality of its editorials far superior to any paper published in this great city. I also admire the moral stand you have taken on advertising, and I believe you will win out, for you are right, and right surely ought to prevail, at least in this free country.

I notice what Dr. Harnden in to-day's issue says in regard to "Taft men" supporting Mr. Roosevelt for President. I have always been a very strong Republican, and when Mr. Roosevelt came out against Mr. Taft in 1912 I was bitter against him and declared I never would vote for him again. But the way he has stood up for Americanism and preparedness right from the beginning of the war has won me over. Under the changed conditions brought about by the world war, it does seem to me he is the most logical and the best qualified man we have to put at the head of this great nation at this time to elevate the standard of Americanism to the point where our forefathers intended we, as Americans, should always stand.

In regard to Mr. Wilson's Mexican policy, I think if he had been trying to make conditions just as bad as possible in that stricken country he could not have done much worse. R. H. PATTERSON.

New York, April 12, 1916.

Beautiful Diction—and Abasement.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: What every red-blooded man likes in Colonel Roosevelt's statement in yesterday's Tribune is the unmistakable evidence that he believes in energetic, positive action just as soon as phraseology fails. He's some letter writer himself, and can turn a phrase as well as our Chief Magistrate, but he believes that when national rights are involved rhetorical patter, suave lingo and expressions of pained surprise will not establish them in the face of a ruthless policy like that which decreed the Lusitania murders.

Had he been President on the 7th of last May there would have been no Lusitania atrocity, and, while he might have exchanged courteous notes with Bernstorff from time to time, as world politics demanded, the correspondence would have been to the point, and no suspicion would have been entertained at other capitals that the American notes did not mean what they said and could be discounted from 95 to 99 per cent without serious risk.

In a few months we shall have an opportunity to express our opinion of this literary Administration and the products of its typewriter. Is there any doubt of the verdict? Is there any one too proud of the State Department's beautiful diction to feel the shame of our national humiliation and abasement? CHARLES F. KINGSLEY.

New York, April 14, 1916.

The Country Needs Him.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Permit me to congratulate you on your action in coming out flatfooted for the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt for the Presidency. I am sure that in so doing you are but voicing the growing conviction in the minds of the mass of the Republican voters of the state that his nomination is necessary and inevitable. He is the one Republican who is absolutely certain to carry the election.

This is no time to take chances or to play politics. There is too much at stake, and the strongest man should be nominated. Like The Tribune, I find it pretty hard to say all this. I was a Taft Republican, and I took his defeat pretty hard. But circumstances alter cases; the country needs a man like Roosevelt, and no satisfactory substitute is in sight; and, while I have not entirely forgiven Roosevelt, I shall gladly vote for him. It is now not a question of old animosities, but of the welfare of the Republic. By all means, let us have Roosevelt.

AN UPSTATE CLERGYMAN.

Utica, N. Y., April 14, 1916.

Of Similar Mind.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read with much pleasure your editorial, "Colonel Roosevelt for President" in The Tribune of April 13, and beg herewith to send you copy of a "Flushing Times" editorial on the same line, published the afternoon of same date.

My editorial was written the evening of April 11, but was crowded out of my paper on the 12th, otherwise "The Times" would have had the honor of leading you by a few hours in this, as I believe, popular movement, rather than the honor, equally high, of following you the same day.

I did not read your editorial until last evening, and then I was impressed with the similarity of our lines of thought in many particulars, although I lift my hat to you as having said what I wished to say far more clearly than I could. A. E. SHOLES,

Editor, "Flushing Times"

Flushing, N. Y., April 14, 1916.

A General Amnesty Declared.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Good for The Tribune! I will forgive it now for all the damnable things it has done in the last fifty years, since I first began to read it. I will even overlook its hellish record on the Jap-Russ war, when it used to misrepresent everything.

In nominating Teddy The Tribune has in a great measure wiped out the wickedness it has committed in teaching false doctrines in all sorts of subjects: money, tariff, medicine, taxation, education, world peace and what-not.

Let me call your attention to my 1912, August 16, letter, containing the following: "It will be hard for some of us to forgive The Tribune for its treatment of Roosevelt."

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF.

Fall River, Mass., April 13, 1916.

A Menace.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Shame on you! You have lost the respect and following of hundreds of men who have been your readers and admirers for years.

Roosevelt is a man of strength, but power unguided and uncontrolled is a menace, as in the case of cyclones and floods. He is dangerous in his strength because he is absolutely insane with egotism, standing on a par with the Kaiser in this respect. He is a traitor to his party, or at least to the Republican party, which he viciously disrupted because it would not nominate him after he had declared he would not again run for President. And you are supporting this man as your candidate.

"How is the mighty fallen!"

No Tribune for me hereafter. P. F.

New York, April 14, 1916.

Hurrah!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "Colonel Roosevelt and no 'pussyfooting'!"

Hurrah for The Tribune! The American paper for Americans! W. N. AMORY.

New York, April 13, 1916.

A SURE SIGN OF SPRING.

NO MORE LIQUOR ADVERTISEMENTS

Congratulations Continue to Pour in Upon The Tribune, Induced by the Denial of Its Columns to the Booze Interests—Naturally There Are Protests, Too, Here and There, Which We Also Print.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I would say that I heartily approve of every constructive method and movement which is in any way beneficial to the development of a more harmonious and constructive consciousness, or thought world, and which therefore produces more harmony in the external world. The modern newspaper cannot afford to do anything less than be the greatest it knows how; neither can it afford to have a consciousness which would permit it to want to be less great than its greatest ideal, for it is really the consciousness that counts rather than the act, for it is much easier to eliminate the act or objective manifestation and its effect than it is to change the consciousness or thought back of the act.

Because of this fact the start made by a modern newspaper like The Tribune in eliminating liquor advertisements of all kinds is a good one, but it should be followed up by teaching its readers how to displace any want for liquor or any other destructive thing which they might have in their consciousness, for only by having this want displaced in one's consciousness can the real root of the liquor question and every other question be reached. F. W. SEARS,

Speaker, the New Thought Church.

New York, April 7, 1916.

Gratified

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is a source of great gratification to me to learn that The Tribune has ceased cooperation with the liquor interests by barring all liquor advertisements from its columns.

The newspaper is the greatest public educator in the world, and on economic grounds alone it ought not to help push an uneconomic interest.

If men could drink or not as they liked without any particular harm to the community there might be some reason for permitting the liquor business. Scientific experiments have made it plain that all liquor drinking is harmful and that no liquor drinking is helpful.

I am glad your paper has taken this position, and I wish it success in further discovering that all moral wrongs are economic wrongs. ALLYN K. FOSTER.

Washington Avenue Baptist Church.

Brooklyn, April 11, 1916.

Why Not Be Consistent?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have no quarrel with the liquor interests; we parted company some years ago after a brief and interesting acquaintance; and I don't keep company with the Prohibitionists.

Universal prohibition may be obtained by law, but universal temperance can only be obtained by education.

The Tribune's new policy of not publishing liquor advertisements is a step in the right direction, but why not be consistent? Why refuse to accept good money for advertising a certain commodity and then advertise it free?

Briggs may find golf a stupid game without the "nineteenth hole," and it may be impossible to play kelly pool without the usual round after each game, but—well, as I asked before, why not be consistent?

MALCOLM C. FRASER.

White Plains, N. Y., April 8, 1916.

From Extreme to Extreme.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I claim a little space to express surprise that you should feel obliged to abstain from recommending all forms of alcoholic drinks?

From a temperate standpoint, France, Germany, Italy and Spain seem to get on very well, and they are wine or beer drinking countries.

When France discovered that absinthe was injurious she did not legislate against red or white wines. She merely suppressed the dangerous and insidious drink, and it would be unthinkable to suppose that any of the cultivated nations of Europe would suppress every form of alcoholic drink merely because some strong drinks are injurious.

That is the difference between intelligent reforms and the sweeping, capricious manner we deal with such matters over here.

We are constantly swinging from extreme to extreme, and the greater its puritanical aspect the better we seem pleased. We shall be very good eventually—but at the cost of our common sense and happiness.

There will be very little freedom in a land where grown-ups are treated like school children.

Sunday is rapidly becoming a day of gloom in most cities and states (I speak from experience), and very different, indeed, from the enjoyable—and still religious—holiday it is in Europe, where friends and families are allowed to amuse themselves, and not turned with disappointment from a locked up universe—on the only day time is abundant.

HENRY J. FINLAY.

New York, April 11, 1916.

Much Impressed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been interested for a long time in the work The Tribune is doing in connection with its advertising. My very dear friend, Dr. Welch, has discussed some of your ideals with me and I am tremendously impressed by them. Your decision with regard to a certain class of advertising seems to me a step in the right direction.

As a social worker I am being brought every day into problems in which alcohol has a very large place. I am constantly depressed by the evidence of ruined child life from this one factor. I congratulate you on your social conscience and achievements.

HERMAN C. WEBER.

City Park Branch, First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, April 7, 1916.

A Tribute of Respect.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Allow me to offer you both my congratulations upon discontinuing all liquor advertisements and my tribute of sincere respect. I am aware that a newspaper that takes this position undergoes a risk of large financial loss. You will win, on the other hand, the respect of all who have at heart the great moral interests of the country, and I earnestly hope that their respect will be seconded by their support. I shall take opportunity to mention this decision to which The Tribune has come.

LEWIS T. REED.

Flatbush Congregational Church.

Brooklyn, April 6, 1916.

A Twentieth Century Publication.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your stand on liquor advertisements is certainly a commendable one, and no doubt is indorsed by every one in this city interested in moral uplift.

It gives one pleasure to read a newspaper which will be consistent enough to come out against alcoholic liquors and at the same time back up its stand by refusing all advertisements pertaining to same.

Yours is certainly a "twentieth century" publication and deserves not a little credit.

Brooklyn, April 10, 1916. A. KEIFER.

Thanks.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Allow me to thank and congratulate you upon the high moral stand you have taken in regard to the advertising of liquor interests. May the good work go on, and God bless you.

Mrs. HELEN L. DUNCAN.

Leonia, N. J., April 16, 1916.

Amen!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have been a reader of The Tribune for years, and to come across Old Crow Whiskey and Duffy's Malt Whiskey ads always gave my ideas of the fitness of things a hard wrench. It's just grand to be able to read "No more liquor advertisements." Amen!

J. A. HAND.

Moosic, Penn., April 12, 1916.

IF WE GO TO WAR

Speculations Concerning the Probable Course of Events.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In view of the fact that for nearly a year past there have been innumerable "crises" between Germany and the United States there seems to have been very little public discussion and analysis of just what war would mean for the countries involved.

I would suggest the following order of events as a possible sequence. In the first place, there would be a necessary rearrangement for the care of the diplomatic and other interests of the United States and Germany, respectively, both as between themselves and in the other belligerent countries. In the second place, there would presumably come the confiscation of all German ships now interned in American waters, and the immediate use by us of such ships, so far as necessary, for the purposes of war or commerce. In the third place, the United States, instead of seeking to embarrass Great Britain and her allies in enforcing their blockade against Germany, would employ every means in its power to assist the Allies in making that blockade effective. Holland, Sweden, and all the other neutral countries, recognizing the farreaching character of our intervention in the war, would at once swing into line and take such action as would compel an early peace.

Undoubtedly the most important service that America could render to itself, the Allies and the world at large, including ultimately the Central Powers themselves, would be represented by the ranging of our vast economic and financial resources on the side of the Allies, and that, too, in the form of a contribution by the American people through their government, and not simply by a banker's private loan. As our fleet would be superfluous and we have no army, this would seem to be about the only important thing we could just now do, and it might be very important.

Such action on our part could not fail to convince Germany of the hopelessness of her struggle, and thus put an end to the present worse than useless international exhaustion (ultimately including ourselves) now devastating the whole world, to its untold detriment for generations to come.

Now, on the other hand, it would seem that inasmuch as we are securely protected by the British fleet, supplemented by our own from the danger of any invasion of our country by Germany, the sole offensive move by that country against us would be represented by the torpedoing of a certain number of our merchant ships engaged in the transatlantic trade. Inasmuch as this form of attack would presumably be of short duration and might well include the destruction of some of the German ships now interned in our harbors, it would seem but an insignificant price to pay for the return of peace.

I respectfully submit to the consideration of our fellow citizens of German blood and sympathy, no less than to the German people themselves, one possible factor of transcendent importance to Germany should we now enter the war on behalf of the Allies, and it is this: When the hour comes for fixing the terms of the inevitable peace that must follow this war the United States, sitting in a position of authority around the council board of the nations, might well play the part of Germany's best friend in saving her, both now and after the war, from the financial and economic ruin that stares her in the face. A. W. W.

Augusta, Ga., April 11, 1916.

Anti-Root.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I see by your issue of this date that the G. O. P. proposes nominating Root for the Presidency.

Has the Republican party gone crazy? Can't the leaders read the writing on the wall shown in the result last November in New York State?

I am a lifelong Republican, but I will not vote for Root, and I know of many others who are of the same opinion. Root will surely go down in defeat. Let them nominate the proper man and win next November.

A LIFELONG REPUBLICAN.

New York, April 8, 1916.